

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 12-18, 22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as allegedly being anticipated by van Hoff. In response, the independent claims 1, 12 and 22 have been amended to obviate the rejection.

Specifically, the rejection has taken the interpretation that the pointers in van Hoff read on the single frame image modules, and that a plurality of "fill images" are obtained from van Hoff's running applets that access images. In response, each of claims 1, 12 and 22 have been amended to recite that the image models are partial images that include locations in places to be filled in, and that the fill images are selected to fill in those locations and places. This specific subject matter is not disclosed, suggested or expectable from van Hoff. van Hoff allows a user to select a set of advertisements. However, the advertisements are simply images that are displayed on the World Wide Web. There is no disclosure of image models with locations that can be filled in by fill images that can be selected by a user, as defined by claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 should be allowable along with the claims that depend therefrom.

Claim 4 has been entirely rewritten to recite a shopping cart, and to recite that the plurality of the fill items represent items for sale, and that items corresponding to all of the selected fill items are automatically added to the shopping cart. Claim 4 allows the completely unexpected and unobvious advantage that a user can view a number of items and can automatically add those items to their shopping cart.

Claim 12 has been amended in a similar way to that discussed above with respect to claim 1. In addition, claim 12 recites that the fill images are items for sale that are associated with the image models, and thus claim 12 is further patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 14 defines automatically adding all the fill items to the shopping cart, in a similar way to that discussed above with respect to claim 4.

Claim 22 has been amended in a similar way to that discussed above with respect to claim 1, and further distinguishes over van Hoff for similar reasons.

Claim 23 has been amended to recite automatically adding items corresponding to all the fill items to the shopping cart, and hence claim 23 should be allowable for these reasons for those discussed above.

Claim 28 has been amended in a similar way, and hence

should be allowable for reasons discussed above.

Claims 7, 9, 11, 17, 19-21, 23, 28-32 and 36-43 stand rejected as being allegedly obvious based on van Hoff in view of Roebuck. Claim 28 has been amended in a similar way to that discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 4, to specifically recite the fill images which can be filled into the model, and that all of the items that are currently displayed as fill images within the model are automatically added to the cart. This is in no way taught or suggested by the cited prior art. The deficiencies of van Hoff were discussed above.

Roebuck is apparently cited merely to show the use of three-dimensional items and viewing those items. With all due respect, the main subject matter discussed above is in no way taught or suggested by the cited prior art.

Claims 33-35 define a remote user making a request to speed up or slow down the presentation. As discussed above, the main subject matter of these claims are in no way taught or suggested by the cited prior art claim should be allowable would reasons.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be

exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully suggested that all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is hence respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that communications such as a telephone interview or email would facilitate disposal of this case, the undersigned respectfully encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail (using the email address harris@schiplaw.com). I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this response to Deposit Account No. 50-4376, small entity.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/13/07 /Scott C Harris/
 Scott C. Harris
 Reg. No. 32,030

Customer No. 74162
Law Office of Scott C. Harris
P.O. Box 1389
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067
Telephone: (858) 756-7778
Facsimile: (858) 756-7717